



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the argument is the discovery made by Dörpfeld that in the peculiar dimensions of the Ionic temple just mentioned, where the proportions are perfect but the unit of linear dimension one hitherto unknown, we have clearly the Samian cubit employed, whose length, .525m., is the only common divisor of all the structural dimensions. The conclusions are of course obvious: Samian artists settling at Locri towards the end of the sixth century made considerable contributions to the expression of the artistic life of that community.

It would be needlessly wearisome to specify in detail how the terra cotta tablets throw light on the religious significance of the myth of the rapture and return of Persephone, on the soul cult, and the related Orphic religion, on the significance of the procession of the wicker basket in the Eleusinian mysteries, the origin and meaning of the Bacchic paean and the dithyramb, and many another historical and cultural problem; but the examples chosen prove the point I wished to make. Every one of these discoveries, and countless others like them, has been made possible only by the strenuous scientific study of the fine arts in Greece, in their local and historical variations—not by dilettante rhapsodizings over the antique like those heard in the Renaissance and the pseudo-classical period, when men could not tell a shoddy Roman copy of the second century of our era from a Greek original of the fifth century before Christ, and were constantly imposed upon by wretched modern frauds and even more atrocious restorations.

A serious critical study of art history is the only sort that can help or interest the classicist. Few subjects are so liable to sciolistic treatment and so insufferable when thus treated. The solemn announcement of the obvious which is so often to be heard, for example, 'This figure has lost its legs from the knees down', or 'the cloak is draped over a support', or 'the weight rests on the right leg and the left elbow,' or 'the goddess holds a spear and wears a helmet', etc., etc., is of course useless and stultifying; but even such wooden pronouncements are preferable to sentimental attitudinizing over some graceful neck, or sensuous lips, or charming *naïveté*, or any other of those banal phrases which disgust those whom William James used to call the "tough-minded". Let the student know what he sees, and what it means, its genetic relations backwards and forwards in the history of art and of culture, and then leave it to him to discover the beauty for himself. If he can, it will be his permanent possession; if he cannot, any expenditure of time and eloquence is useless. Let the work done be serious, concentrated, exacting, let it aim at developing powers of criticism and discrimination, and an independent judgment, and finally, in the gifted few, foster the talent for creative work.

And now let us consider for a moment the whole matter from a more detached and general point of view. Let us assume, for the sake of the argument,

that the acquisition of liberal culture is a worthy life-aim, and that proper provision should be made for it in our Colleges of Arts and Sciences. I for one cannot see why our systems of education have done so much for the gratification of our intellectual curiosity, and so little for the satisfaction of our aesthetic interests. The end of the state, said Aristotle, is not merely *life* but a *nobility in life*, and the same may be said of education. Abstractly considered, the beautiful is as worthy an object of consideration as the true. It certainly has greater value for the ennobling of life. The good and the beautiful appealed most forcibly to the greatest of the Greek philosophers. It is a significant tribute to the effect upon them of their own national life and ideals that the search for abstract and urfaesthetic truth bulked so small in their speculations. Our Western civilization has thrown perhaps undue influence upon the true. Without attempting to reverse an age-long prejudice, we are surely justified in claiming for the beautiful, if not absolute equality with the good and the true, at all events, an honorable place beside them among our educational ideals.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

W. A. OLDFATHER.

THE SEQUENCE OF EVENTS AFTER CAESAR'S DEATH

In view of the peculiar arrangement of the chronology of events after Caesar's death made by certain modern authorities, such as Gardthausen, Schiller and Ferrero, it has seemed advantageous to make a brief study of the sources for the first two days.

When their task was completed and Caesar lay dead, the conspirators turned to address the Senate, to inform its members that, with the tyrant¹, the tyranny was destroyed and the republic established. They intended to have Caesar's estate confiscated and his acts rescinded². They doubtless also expected to be surrounded by a joyful body of senators and to be acclaimed as Liberators. But the Senate was looking out for its own safety. All around had fled amidst the utmost confusion, senators and Caesarians alike³. However, the conspirators did not lose confidence in the Senate. The flight of the Senate, they thought, was merely from ignorance and alarm; its members were their own friends and relatives and would eventually, they felt sure, rally to their support⁴.

It became necessary then to appeal to the people. Daggers in hand, the assassins rushed into the Forum, shouting that they had slain a king and a tyrant. One bore upon a spear a freedman's cap, a symbol of liberty⁵. But in the Forum they found worse confusion. The people were pouring forth from the theater and running in all directions, amid a terrific clamor⁶. The market was plundered and in the excitement some even were killed⁷. Brutus addressed those who were in the Forum and succeeded in quieting

¹Appian, B.C. 2.119.

²Suetonius, Caesar 82.

³Ap-

pian, 2.118; Nicolaus, Vita Caesaris 25.

⁴Appian, 2. 119.

⁵Appian. 2.119.

⁶Nicolaus, 25.

⁷Appian, 2.118.

them to some extent⁸. But the people did not fulfill the expectations of the conspirators; its attitude, amid the general confusion, was neither hostile nor friendly. There was, however, a large number of Caesar's veterans and supporters in the crowd, and of these the conspirators were afraid⁹. They turned for protection to a body of gladiators whom Decimus Brutus had hired to come from the theater to the Portico of Pompey for just such a contingency¹⁰. Under their protection the conspirators ascended the Capitoline, ostensibly to offer prayer to the gods¹¹, but in reality as a measure of safety, for they guarded against attack¹² all approaches to the hill.

On the Capitoline the Liberators took counsel. It seemed best to test the people once more when the excitement had somewhat abated¹³. As a necessary precaution and to have a nucleus of supporters to win others, they hired a band of Caesar's veterans who were in the city waiting to be sent to their allotted lands. These men received orders to go to the Forum and shout for peace, and by this device to secure the safety of the murderers, for there could be no peace without amnesty to them¹⁴. When a crowd had been gathered, Cinna, the praetor, laid aside his robe of office and began to praise the deed of the Liberators and to attack Caesar. His attempt with the crowd failed and he was followed by the consul-elect Dolabella, seeking cover from his enemy Antony. Then the claque took courage, applauded loudly, and called for the leaders themselves.

Doubtless in accordance with a preconceived plan, Brutus and Cassius descended with a body-guard of gladiators and slaves, to make trial of the people whether they were to be received as liberators and tyrannicides or as murderers¹⁵. The people, fearing and expectant, received them with silence. Brutus was known to them as a man of high rank and reputation and they listened to him readily¹⁶. Appian records that Brutus and Cassius spoke in no humble manner. They lauded each other and Decimus Brutus, proclaimed the restoration of liberty, advised the recall of Sextus Pompeius, and above all exhorted the people to remember and emulate the virtues of their ancestors¹⁷. Their speeches, however, failed to secure the desired effect¹⁸. Neither Brutus nor Cassius was a speaker capable of rousing a crowd to action. Furthermore, they had both misjudged the material at hand. They did not see that the proletariat of the Rome of their day, composed as it was of the lazy, the beggars, the vagrants of all Italy and the discharged soldiers of the late wars, was no longer the sturdy citizenship of the early Republic. Nor did they understand that citizens who could so readily be bribed could not at the same time be lovers of liberty¹⁹.

Once more they were compelled to ascend the Capitoline to seek safety²⁰.

That evening there came to the Capitoline many of the aristocrats, among them a joyful Cicero, to assure the Liberators of their support²¹. The situation was thoroughly discussed. Cicero advised immediate action, urged Brutus and Cassius, in their capacity of praetors, to summon the Senate to the Capitoline at once and thereby secure control of the reins of government²². This act, however, would savor of usurpation and might lead to violence, from which Brutus shrank²³. It was accordingly decided best to enter into negotiations with the Caesarian party and to endeavor to persuade it to a compromise²⁴.

In the planning of the assassination, many had suggested the advisability of removing, along with Caesar, Antony, Caesar's colleague in the consulship and his chief supporter. Brutus opposed this as unjust, possibly also in the hope of Antony's ultimate reform; his wishes prevailed²⁵. Accordingly, Trebonius delayed Antony with conversation while Caesar was being killed²⁶. In the uproar following, Antony fled in alarm²⁷. Assisted by friends, he disguised himself and succeeded in reaching his home on the Esquiline²⁸, where he barricaded his doors and awaited developments²⁹. When he learned of the flight to the Capitol, he regained his confidence³⁰. That night he played his great coup when he secured the transfer of Caesar's money and all his official papers to his own house³¹. The powers these gave him put him definitely at the head of the Caesarian party.

Lepidus, Antony's only competitor, was in the Forum when he heard the news of Caesar's death. He fled immediately to the island in the river, where he was collecting troops preparatory to departing for Gaul. These troops he led at once over into the Campus³² and that night he occupied the Forum³³.

Such, then, was the situation of the Caesarians when the messengers came from the conspirators. Cicero had steadfastly refused to have anything to do with the embassy³⁴, but other consulars were present on the Capitol and were willing to undertake it. The tone of the conspirators in this message was humble; they asked merely toleration for the good of the country³⁵ and invited both Antony and Lepidus to the Capitol for deliberation³⁶. Both replied that they would answer the next day³⁷. The second day was taken up by both sides in rallying supporters. In the morning Lepidus harangued the soldiers in the Forum and promised vengeance³⁸. The colonized soldiers flocked into the city intent on having a hand in this vengeance³⁹. Others supported the assassins and declared that

⁸Nicolaus, 25. ⁹Appian, 2.119. ¹⁰Nicolaus, 26. ¹¹Dio Cassius, 44.21. ¹²Nicolaus, 25. ¹³Nicolaus, 26. ¹⁴Appian, 2.121.2. ¹⁵Nicolaus, 26. ¹⁶Nicolaus, 26. ¹⁷Appian, 2.122; Dio Cassius, 44.21. ¹⁸Plutarch, Caesar 67. ¹⁹Appian, 2.120.

²⁰Appian, 2.123. ²¹Dio Cassius, 44.21. ²²Cicero, Ad Att. 14.10.1. ²³Cf. Boissier, Cicero and his Friends, 338 ff. ²⁴Nicolaus, 27. ²⁵Nicolaus, 25; Plutarch, Brutus 18. ²⁶Appian, 2.117. ²⁷Cicero, Philippics 2.35. ²⁸Plutarch, Antony 14. ²⁹Appian, 2.118. ³⁰Plutarch, Antony 14; Dio Cassius, 44.22. ³¹Appian, 2.125; Plutarch, Antony 15. ³²Appian, 2.118. ³³Appian, 2.126; Dio Cassius, 44.22. ³⁴Cicero, Philippics 2.35. ³⁵Appian, 2.123. ³⁶Nicolaus, 27. ³⁷Nicolaus, 27. ³⁸Dio Cassius, 44.22. ³⁹Nicolaus, 17.

liberty was restored³⁹. These, together with slaves to whom liberty had been promised, flocked to the Capitoline⁴⁰.

The second evening the Caesarian leaders held a conference⁴¹. Lepidus urged that they take the army, seize the conspirators, and avenge their great leader. Hirtius advised compromise and reconciliation. Antony agreed to this, probably that the power might not go into Lepidus's hands through the use of the army. Lepidus was compelled to yield and the Caesarian leaders sent a message to the capitol, stating that, in spite of their oaths to Caesar, they were willing to consider matters in the Senate for the good of the city⁴². Antony took over the administration of the city, placed watches about, and had fires lighted to prevent treachery⁴³. In accordance with his promise, he called the Senate to meet the following morning, March 17, at the temple of Tellus⁴⁴. At this meeting the amnesty was made official.

This résumé of the two days following Caesar's death differs from the accounts given by Schiller, *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit*, I. 1, Chapter 1, 2, Gardthausen, *Augustus und Seine Zeit*, I. 1, Chapter 2, and Ferrero, *Greatness and Decline of Rome*, 2, Chapter 1, in the date assigned to the meeting in the Forum. All of these authorities place that meeting on the second day, March 16⁴⁵. The authority for this view seems to be Plutarch, *Caesar* 67. The reasons for differing with this opinion are based on Nicolaus, Appian and Dio Cassius, all of whom agree in putting the meeting on the first day. Nicolaus (26) records that, after the conspirators had reached the capitol, they decided to make trial of the people. Appian, *Bellum Civile* 2. 121. 2, treats the meeting in considerable detail, without remarking the passage of a night. Dio Cassius writes (44.21) of an assembly late in the day in which the assassins addressed the people. He omits mention of an earlier ascent to the Capitol.

Appian (2. 123) states that, as the conspirators returned from the assembly, they enabled their friends and relatives to come to them in the temple and sent from among them messengers to Antony and Lepidus. Nicolaus says (27): 'After the assembly, returning to the Capitol, they deliberated what was best to be done. It seemed advisable to send ambassadors to Antony and Lepidus'. These two statements make it evident that the negotiations with the Caesarian party did not begin till after the assembly in the Forum. Cicero, in the *Second Philippic* 35, shows clearly that the negotiations began the first night. Appian, it is true, is not always exact in chronology, since he puts the meeting of the Senate on the second day instead of on the third. His statement in this particular case, however, is corroborated by Nicolaus, who was the nearest to the deed in point of time and appears to be accurate. Again, if we accept the statements of our

three ancient authorities that the Liberators did not treat with the Caesarians until after the assembly in the Forum, the evidence of Cicero that the negotiations began on the night of March 15 will force us to the conclusion that the assembly in the Forum took place on March 15 instead of on March 16.

WALLACE E. CALDWELL.

FELLOW IN ANCIENT HISTORY.
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

THE MILITARY TACTICS OF CAESAR AND OF TO-DAY

We who believe that the classical languages are not dead, but are in reality very much alive, have, in the matter of military tactics, a new testimony to the correctness of our belief. Xenophon may be the admitted teacher of tactics to many (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 8.34); but it is in Caesar and other Roman authors that we find the employment of methods of warfare that are being so closely repeated to-day in the lamentable war ravaging Europe and, for that matter, most of the world, that we exclaim once more, 'There is nothing new under the sun'.

The Roman conquered the world as much by the spade as by the sword. He never willingly delivered battle without having at his rear a fortified camp to which he might fall back; he never even passed the night without having constructed around himself such a camp. This camp was encircled by a wall and a ditch; on the wall there were small redoubts containing every one a post of soldiers, who patrolled the wall halfway to the next redoubt on each side, and served as a defending force; but reinforcements might be hurried to any point from the main body resting within the camp, their free motion being facilitated by a wide, open passageway extending all the way around inside the walls, between the walls and the tents.

Our knowledge of the present European War is beclouded more or less by the activities of press censors and of partisan pleaders, but the method of tactics seems reasonably clear, and not in any way open to dispute. The front of the army, so write the military experts in the periodicals, is a great one-sided fortress, facing the enemy, with long lines of trenches, in which the soldiers remain when on the firing line. For greater safety, these trenches are in the form of a sunken passageway, rather than of a raised wall and a ditch; but in essence they are the same as the wall and the ditch which formed the side of the Roman camp. Within these trenches the soldiers are not arranged evenly, one every so many feet or yards, but are stationed by groups more or less strong every hundred yards or so, an arrangement which quite parallels the redoubts on the wall of the Roman camp, with their battalions; these posts are responsible for the defense of the more or less vacant space on either side. Larger detachments are kept somewhat to the rear, ready to be rushed to any point which the enemy

³⁹Nicolaus, 17. ⁴¹Nicolaus, 27. ⁴²Appian, 2.124.
⁴⁰Appian, 2.125. ⁴³Appian, 2.1. ⁴⁴Gardthausen, I.1.
p. 33; Schiller, I, p. 13; Ferrero, 8 ff.